UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/537,439	06/16/2005	Ennio Ongini	026220-00066	3232
4372 ARENT FOX	7590 11/29/2007 L.L.P		EXAM	INER
1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.			YOUNG, SHAWQUIA	
SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		1626	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/29/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCIPDocket@arentfox.com IPMatters@arentfox.com Patent Mail@arentfox.com

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/537,439	ONGINI ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Shawquia Young	1626			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinuity iii apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 September 2007</u> .					
,—	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)□	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 6-12 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11 and 12 is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 6-12 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	drawn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers	•				
10)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Setion is required if the drawing(s) is of	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). Djected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachmei	nt(e)					
1) Noti 2) Noti 3) Info	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date			

Art Unit: 1626

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1,3, 4 and 6-112 are currently pending in the instant application.

Applicants have cancelled claims 2 and 5 in an amendment filed on September 7, 2007.

I. Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments/amendments, filed on September 7, 2007, have overcome the following rejection(s) and objection(s): the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement; the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite; the objection of claim 1-10 as containing non-elected subject matter; the objection of claims 1,2 and 6 for informalities; the objection of the oath as being defective; and the objection of the specification for not ending in a period. The above rejections and objections are withdrawn.

The Examiner has extended the definition of Y to include the disclosed aromatic linker.

II. Rejection(s)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112,1st paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As stated in the MPEP 2164.01 (a), "There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue".

In *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (1988), factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have need described. They are:

- 1. the nature of the invention,
- 2. the state of the prior art,
- 3. the predictability or lack thereof in the art,
- 4. the amount of direction or guidance present,
- 5. the presence or absence of working examples,
- 6. the breadth of the claims,
- 7. the quantity of experimentation needed, and
- 8. the level of the skill in the art.

In the instant case,

The nature of the invention

Application/Control Number: 10/537,439

Art Unit: 1626

The nature of the invention is drawn to compounds according to claim 1 to be employed as a drug.

The state of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art

The state of the prior art is that the pharmacological art involves screening *in vitro* and *in vivo* to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities (i.e. what compounds can treat which specific disease by what mechanism). There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face.

The instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable as discussed below:

It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. In re Fisher, 427 F. 2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute Applicants' claims are drawn to compounds according to claim 1 to be employed as a drug.

Applicants' claim 10 is a broad claim that encompasses the use of the instantly claimed compounds as a drug for the treatment of any disease or disorder. Applicants have failed to state what diseases applicants considered treatable by the claimed compounds in claim 10. It is the state of the prior art that the term "drug" is defined as a substance used in the diagnosis, treatment, or prevention of a disease or as a component of a medication.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,439 Page 5

Art Unit: 1626

The amount of direction present and the presence or absence of working

examples

The only direction or guidance present in the instant specification is minimal.

There are no working examples present for the treatment of the diseases encompassed

by the broad claim 10 except for the treatment of neuropathic pain.

Test assays and procedure are provided in the specification at pages 26-29 for

Writhing test, Paw licking test and Paw pressure test. It is inconceivable as to how the

claimed compounds can treat the extremely difficult diseases embraced by the instant

claims.

The breadth of the claims

The breadth of the claims is drawn to compounds according to claim 1 to be

employed as a drug.

The quantity of experimentation needed

The quantity of experimentation needed is undue experimentation. One of skill in

the art would need to determine what diseases out of all conditions would be benefited

by the activity of the claimed compounds and would furthermore then have to determine

which of the claimed compounds in the instant invention would provide treatment of the

diseases.

The level of the skill in the art

Application/Control Number: 10/537,439 Page 6

Art Unit: 1626

The level of skill in the art is high. However, due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity by *in vitro* or *in vivo* screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.

The specification fails to provide sufficient support of the broad use of the claimed compounds of the invention to be employed as a drug. As a result necessitating one of skill to perform an exhaustive search for which diseases can be treated by what compounds of the invention in order to practice the claimed invention.

Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S (CA FC) 42 USPQ2d 1001, states that "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion" and "patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable".

Therefore, in view of the Wands factors and In re Fisher (CCPA 1970) discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, a person of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to test which diseases can be treated by the compound encompassed in the instant claims, with no assurance of success.

This rejection can be overcome, for example, by deleting claim 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Application/Control Number: 10/537,439 Page 7

Art Unit: 1626

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the radical of an analgesic drug" is not found previously in claim 1 and it is unclear what "radical" Applicant is referring to. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 1,3,4 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the phrase "R₅ may have the following meanings " found in the variable R₅; the phrase "OR_A" R_A having the following meanings" and the phrase "Q may have one of the following meanings" in claim 1 renders the products indefinite as the phrase "R₅ may have the following meanings" found in the variable R₅; the phrase "OR_A" R_A having the following meanings" and the phrase "Q may have one of the following meanings" can be considered open-ended language when not clearly defined and therefore is including additional subject matter in the compounds of the formula I that is not described in the instant specification and is not particularly pointed out or distinctly claimed. A claim to a chemical compound cannot be open-ended, but must be claimed with precision. This rejection can be overcome by amending the phrase "R5 may have the following meanings" to read "R5 is " in claims 1-6; the phrase " R_A having the following meanings" to read " R_A is" and the phrase "Q may have one of the following meanings" to read "Q is".

III. Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawquia Young whose telephone number is 571-272-9043. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM-3:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane can be reached on 571-272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Shawquia Young **Patent Examiner** Art Unit 1626, Group 1620

Technology Center 1600

Joseph McKane Supervisory Patent Examiner Art Unit 1626, Group 1620 Technology Center 1600